UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,701	07/02/2003	James Leonard Platt	AUS920030396US1	5875

34533	7590	01/10/2006	

INTERNATIONAL CORP (BLF)
c/o BIGGERS & OHANIAN, LLP
P.O. BOX 1469
AUSTIN, TX 78767-1469

EXAMINER
MAHMOOD, REZWANUL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/612,701	PLATT, JAMES LEONARD
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Rezwanul Mahmood	2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07/02/03</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>*1-18*</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>*1-18*</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>*02 July 2003*</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4)

because reference character 316 has been used to designate both "Rows" in Fact Table

- 312 and "Dependencies" in Database - 308. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance

with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of

the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the

figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is

being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application

must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet"

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the

applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office

action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

1.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

2.   Throughout the specification both "Rows" in Fact Table - 312 and

"Dependencies" in Database - 308 use the same reference character 316.

3.   Throughout the specification, "dimension tables (318)" should be "dimension

tables (314)".

4.   Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6.   Claims 1, 7, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Weissman (US Patent 6,212,524).

7.   With respect to claim 1, Weissman discloses a method for populating a

database, the method comprising:

providing a database having a schema (Weissman: Column 2, lines 26-38, and

67; Column 3, lines 1-2; Column 5, lines 26-32);

inferring from the schema dependencies among a fact table and related

dimension tables (Weissman: Column 3, lines 1-2, and lines 36-38; Column 5,

lines 26-32; Column 7, lines 42-49; Column 10, lines 24-42); and

inserting, in accordance with the dependencies, rows of data into the fact table

and rows of data into the dimension tables (Weissman: Column 3, lines 1-11;

Column 10, lines 24-42).

8.   With respect to claim 7, Weissman discloses a system for populating a database,

the system comprising:

means for providing a database having a schema (Weissman: Column 2, lines

26-38, and 67; Column 3, lines 1-2; Column 5, lines 26-32);

means for inferring from the schema dependencies among a fact table and

related dimension tables (Weissman: Column 3, lines 1-2, and lines 36-38;

Column 5, lines 26-32; Column 7, lines 42-49; Column 10, lines 24-42); and

means for inserting, in accordance with the dependencies, rows of data into the

fact table and rows of data into the dimension tables (Weissman: Column 3, lines

1-11; Column 10, lines 24-42).

9.   With respect to claim 13, Weissman discloses a computer program product for

populating a database, the computer program product comprising:

a recording medium (Weissman: Figure 1);

means, recorded on the recording medium, for providing a database having a

schema (Weissman: Column 2, lines 26-38, and 67; Column 3, lines 1-2; Column

5, lines 26-32);

means, recorded on the recording medium, for inferring from the schema

dependencies among a fact table and related dimension tables (Weissman:

Column 3, lines 1-2, and lines 36-38; Column 5, lines 26-32; Column 7, lines 42-

49; Column 10, lines 24-42); and

means, recorded on the recording medium, for inserting, in accordance with the

dependencies, rows of data into the fact table and rows of data into the

dimension tables (Weissman: Column 3, lines 1-11; Column 10, lines 24-42).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 2, 8, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Weissman (US Patent 6,212,524) in view of Veronese (US Publication

2004/0210445).

12.   With respect to claim 2, Weissman discloses the method of claim 1 as set forth in

the 35 U.S.C. rejection above wherein inferring dependencies further comprises:

selecting from metadata describing a schema for the database expressions of

dependencies (Weissman: Column 7, lines 23-29; Figure 1);

however, does not discloses expressly inserting the expressions of

dependencies into a dependency list.

The Veronese reference, however, discloses building a dependency list for the

expressions of dependencies (Veronese: Paragraph 120, lines, 1-12).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art, to have added a dependency list to insert the database

expressions of dependencies.

The suggestion or motivation of doing so would be to have new development

methodologies, which will be both rapid and easily manageable and modifiable

by the users (Veronese: Paragraph 11, lines 3-5).

A further motivation would be to have an improved data warehousing technology

(Weissman: Column 2, lines 61-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to have added Weissman with Veronese

for the benefit of new development methodologies and improved data

warehousing technology.

13.   With respect to claim 8, Weissman in view of Veronese discloses the system of

claim 7 as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection above wherein means for

inferring dependencies further comprises:

means for selecting from metadata describing a schema for the database

expressions of dependencies (Weissman: Column 7, lines 23-29; Figure 1); and

means for inserting the expressions of dependencies into a dependency list

(Veronese: Paragraph 120, lines, 1-12).

The suggestion or motivation for doing so is the same as the 35 U.S.C 103

rejection above on claim 2.

14.   With respect to claim 14, Weissman in view of Veronese discloses the computer

program product of claim 13 as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection above

wherein means for inferring dependencies further comprises:

means, recorded on the recording medium, for selecting from metadata

describing a schema for the database expressions of dependencies (Weissman:

Column 7, lines 23-29; Figure 1); and

means, recorded on the recording medium, for inserting the expressions of

dependencies into a dependency list (Veronese: Paragraph 120, lines, 1-12).

The suggestion or motivation for doing so is the same as the 35 U.S.C 103

rejection above on claim 2.

15.   Claims 3-6, 9-12, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Weissman (US Patent 6,212,524) in view of Veronese (US

Publication 2004/0210445) as applied to claims 2, 8, and 14 above, and further in view

of Medicke (US Publication 2004/0236786).

16.   With respect to claim 3, Weissman in view of Veronese discloses the method of

claim 1 as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 rejections above, however,

does not disclose expressly, wherein inserting rows of data further comprises:

determining whether related dimension data exists for each foreign key in each

row of data inserted into the fact table; and

for each foreign key for which related dimension data does not exist, inserting a

row of dimension data into a dimension table related to the fact table through the

foreign key.

The Medicke reference, however, discloses determining whether related

dimension data exists for each foreign key in each row of data inserted into the

fact table, and for each foreign key for which related dimension data does not

exist, inserting a row of dimension data into a dimension table related to the fact

table through the foreign key (Medicke: Paragraph 73, lines 10-27; Figure 7, and

9; Weissman: Column 13, lines 25-67; Column 14, lines 8-67; Column 15, lines

1-15).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art, to have determined if dimension data exists for each foreign key in

the fact table and inserting such data if it did not exist.

The suggestion or motivation of doing so would be to generate a data warehouse

by incorporating data warehouse information in business objects to provide

subscribed business objects and generating star-schema tables of the data

warehouse from the subscribed business objects (Medicke: Paragraph 9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Weissman, Veronese, and

Medicke for the benefit of generating a data warehouse.

The suggestion or motivation is the same as above for the following claim

rejections.

17.   With respect to claim 4, Weissman in view of Veronese and in further view of

Medicke discloses the method of claim 1 wherein inserting rows of data further

comprises:

determining whether related dimension data exists for each foreign key in each

row of data inserted into a first dimension table (Medicke: Paragraph 73, lines 10-

27; Figure 7, and 9; Weissman: Column 13, lines 25-67; Column 14, lines 8-67;

Column 15, lines 1-15); and

for each foreign key for which related dimension data does not exist, inserting a

row of dimension data into a second dimension table related to the first

dimension table through the foreign key (Medicke: Paragraph 73, lines 10-27;

Figure 7, and 9; Weissman: Column 13, lines 25-67; Column 14, lines 8-67;

Column 15, lines 1-15; Column 37, lines 30-35).

18.   With respect to claim 5, Weissman in view of Veronese and in further view of

Medicke discloses the method of claim 1 wherein inserting rows of data further

comprises:

reading the rows of data from a first database, the first database comprising

dependencies among tables in the database (Weissman: Column 9, lines 43-60);

and

inserting rows of data into a second database, the second database comprising

at least the same dependencies as in the first database (Weissman: Column 10,

lines 23-57; Medicke: Figure 9).

19.   With respect to claim 6, Weissman in view of Veronese and in further view of

Medicke discloses the method of claim 1 wherein a dependency comprises a rule

for the database, enforced by a database management system, that a first record

in a first table must exist in the database before a second record in a second

table may be inserted in the database (Veronese: Paragraph 120, lines 1-12;

Medicke: Paragraph 14, lines 8-10; Paragraph 65, lines 9-11).

20.   With respect to claim 9, Weissman in view of Veronese and in further view of

Medicke discloses the system of claim 7 wherein means for inserting rows of

data further comprises:

means for determining whether related dimension data exists for each foreign

key in each row of data inserted into the fact table (Medicke: Paragraph 73, lines

10-27; Figure 7, and 9; Weissman: Column 13, lines 25-67; Column 14, lines 8-

67; Column 15, lines 1-15); and

for each foreign key for which related dimension data does not exist, means for

inserting a row of dimension data into a dimension table related to the fact table

through the foreign key (Medicke: Paragraph 73, lines 10-27; Figure 7, and 9;

Weissman: Column 13, lines 25-67; Column 14, lines 8-67; Column 15, lines 1-

15).

21.   With respect to claim 10, Weissman in view of Veronese and in further view of

Medicke discloses the system of claim 7 wherein means for inserting rows of

data further comprises:

means for determining whether related dimension data exists for each foreign

key in each row of data inserted into a first dimension table (Medicke: Paragraph

73, lines 10-27; Figure 7, and 9; Weissman: Column 13, lines 25-67; Column 14,

lines 8-67; Column 15, lines 1-15); and

for each foreign key for which related dimension data does not exist, means for

inserting a row of dimension data into a second dimension table related to the

first dimension table through the foreign key (Medicke: Paragraph 73, lines 10-

27; Figure 7, and 9; Weissman: Column 13, lines 25-67; Column 14, lines 8-67;

Column 15, lines 1-15; Column 37, lines 30-35).

22.   With respect to claim 11, Weissman in view of Veronese and in further view of

Medicke discloses the system of claim 7 wherein means for inserting rows of

data further comprises:

means for reading the rows of data from a first database, the first database

comprising dependencies among tables in the database (Weissman: Column 9,

lines 43-60); and

means for inserting rows of data into a second database, the second database

comprising at least the same dependencies as in the first database (Weissman:

Column 10, lines 23-57; Medicke: Figure 9).

23.   With respect to claim 12, Weissman in view of Veronese and in further view of

Medicke discloses the system of claim 7 wherein a dependency comprises a rule

for the database, enforced by a database management system, that a first record

in a first table must exist in the database before a second record in a second

table may be inserted in the database (Veronese: Paragraph 120, lines 1-12;

Medicke: Paragraph 14, lines 8-10; Paragraph 65, lines 9-11).

24.   With respect to claim 15, Weissman in view of Veronese and in further view of

Medicke discloses the computer program product of claim 13 wherein means for

inserting rows of data further comprises:

means, recorded on the recording medium, for determining whether related

dimension data exists for each foreign key in each row of data inserted into the

fact table (Medicke: Paragraph 73, lines 10-27; Figure 7, and 9; Weissman:

Column 13, lines 25-67; Column 14, lines 8-67; Column 15, lines 1-15); and

for each foreign key for which related dimension data does not exist, means,

recorded on the recording medium, for inserting a row of dimension data into a

dimension table related to the fact table through the foreign key (Medicke:

Paragraph 73, lines 10-27; Figure 7, and 9; Weissman: Column 13, lines 25-67;

Column 14, lines 8-67; Column 15, lines 1-15).

25.   With respect to claim 16, Weissman in view of Veronese and in further view of

Medicke discloses the computer program product of claim 13 wherein means for

inserting rows of data further comprises:

means, recorded on the recording medium, for determining whether related

dimension data exists for each foreign key in each row of data inserted into a first

dimension table (Medicke: Paragraph 73, lines 10-27; Figure 7, and 9;

Weissman: Column 13, lines 25-67; Column 14, lines 8-67; Column 15, lines 1-

15); and

for each foreign key for which related dimension data does not exist, means,

recorded on the recording medium, for inserting a row of dimension data into a

second dimension table related to the first dimension table through the foreign

key (Medicke: Paragraph 73, lines 10-27; Figure 7, and 9; Weissman: Column

13, lines 25-67; Column 14, lines 8-67; Column 15, lines 1-15; Column 37, lines

30-35).

26.   With respect to claim 17, Weissman in view of Veronese and in further view of

Medicke discloses the computer program product of claim 13 wherein means for

inserting rows of data further comprises:

means, recorded on the recording medium, for reading the rows of data from a

first database, the first database comprising dependencies among tables in the

database (Weissman: Column 9, lines 43-60); and

means, recorded on the recording medium, for inserting rows of data into a

second database, the second database comprising at least the same

dependencies as in the first database (Weissman: Column 10, lines 23-57;

Medicke: Figure 9).

27.   With respect to claim 18, Weissman in view of Veronese and in further view of

Medicke discloses the computer program product of claim 13 wherein a

dependency comprises a rule for the database, enforced by a database

management system, that a first record in a first table must exist in the database

before a second record in a second table may be inserted in the database

(Veronese: Paragraph 120, lines 1-12; Medicke: Paragraph 14, lines 8-10;

Paragraph 65, lines 9-11).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Rezwanul Mahmood whose telephone number is

(571)272-5625. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571)272-4085. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Rezwanul Mahmood
Ph # 571-272-5625

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER